



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,899	03/01/2002	Shane Dexter	DEV 01-38-1	5129

7590 10/10/2003
SEAN PATRICK SUITER
SUITER & ASSOCIATES PC
14301 FNB PARKWAY, SUITE 220
OMAHA, NE 68154-5299

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, THOR S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3742

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,899

Applicant(s)

DEXTER ET AL.

Examiner

Thor S. Campbell

Art Unit

3742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 11-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10,34 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 17, 18, 20-24 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6467394. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory-double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 8-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6467394 in view of Polk et al. (US 4926904) or Saney (US 5871152). Both Polk and Saney disclose pressure washing devices having pulse dampening hoses connected thereto in order to minimize pressure fluctuations. It

Art Unit: 3742

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a pressure pulse dampening hose in order to minimize pressure fluctuation as is well known in the art.

Claims 19-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,431,844. '844 claims the same invention with the exception of a framed engine assembly for driving the pump it is generally well known in the art to provide framed engine assembly coupled to a pressure pump to provide for a portable unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device claimed in '844 to include a frame and engine assembly in order to make a pressure washing system that is portable.

Claims 28-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,394. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claims are merely broader than the patent claim. Once an applicant has received a patent for a more specific embodiment, applicant is not entitled to a patent for a broader invention. See *In re Goodman*. The generic invention is anticipated by the species of the patented invention. With respect to the claim limitations of a cylinder formed in a pump housing, these limitations are considered to be inherent in the patent claims.

Claims 33 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,431,844. '844 claims the same invention with the exception of an unloader valve, it is generally well known in the art to provide an unloader valve coupled to a pressure washer to provide for relieving pressure on the unit when not in use. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 3742

device claimed in '844 to include an unloader valve in order to provide for relieving pressure on the unit when not in use.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-18 are allowed.

Claims 10, and 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thor S. Campbell whose telephone number is 703-306-9042. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fri 5:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sang Paik can be reached on 703-308-1147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0861.

TSC



**THOR CAMPBELL
PATENT EXAMINER**